

PKL



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,098	03/06/2001	Jeffrey C. Curie	036258-0207	2735

7590 03/16/2004

Ted R. Rittmaster
Foley & Lardner
Suite 3500
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3021

EXAMINER

ENG, DAVID Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

/6

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,098

Applicant(s)

CURIE ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID Y. ENG

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2155

The drawings are objected to because lack of legends. Certain rectangular boxes in the drawings have not been labeled with legends. See Figure 9 for example. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification fails to disclose programmable steps or programmable flow charts for each of the method steps recited in the independent claims. For example, the specification fails to disclose respective programmable flow charts to show how a computer establishes a set of organization attributes and user roles etc.; how a computer defines a plurality of resource provisioning policy for each organization based on selected organization attributes and user roles; how a computer determines which resource provisioning policies are applicable to the user based on the received user role information, etc.; how a computer provisioning resources internal to the organization

Art Unit: 2155

based on the applicable resource provisioning policies; and how a computer cross-provisioning resources as recited in the claims.

Applicants are requested to identify the definition of "organizational attributes" and "organizational information" in the specification. Applicants are further requested to identify the components recited in claims 16, 20 and 29 in the drawings and the description thereof in the specification in accordance with 37CFR 1.75d1 and 1.83a.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Lumelsky

Applicants admit prior art teaching of RBAC (Role Based Access Control) and RPM for provisioning access of resources by users over communication network. The method step of establishing a set of organizational attributes, organizational information and user roles for each organization and the step of defining a plurality of resource provisioning policies for each organization based on the established information are inherent in a resource provisioning system. In lines et seq. of line 13 page 4, Applicants state that there is a need for third party providers of RPM services because the cost required to implement a RPM may discourage some organizations to do so. Third party resource provisioning system is well known in the art. See the abstract, Figures 1 and 2 and the corresponding description thereof and column 5, line 39 et seq.; column 10 lines 42-51 and column lines 28-31 in Lumelsky. Lumelsky teaches a third party provisioning system provider for provisioning external and internal resources (see

Art Unit: 2155

Access Right in Figure 2, access control in line 42 of column 5) of a plurality of organizations (see clients in Figure 1, see clients and subscribers in lines 1-10 of column 7) using a server (see server in Figure 5, column 6 lines 50-53, provisioning servers in lines 3 of column 7, administrator server in line 40 of 11). From the teaching of Lumelsky, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide a resource provisioning system such as RBAC or RPM remotely over a network using servers (providing a third party system or a commercial system) for a plurality of organization so as to cut or share cost.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky (USP 6,460,082) in view of Schneider (USP 6,408,336).

Details of the rejection has already been set forth in the last Office action.

In the communication submitted on 9/23/2003, Applicants contended that a teaching or suggestion provisioning resources based on attributes and roles is completely absent from both Lumelsky and Schneider. The Examiner disagrees. Meeting certain predetermined conditions (attributes or user role) before levels of privilege of access to resources (does not matter they are internal or external; soft or hard) can be given is inherent in a resource provisioning system. Applicants admitted that in the Description of Related Art on pages 1-5. Further, in Lumelsky the user has to be at least a subscriber (role) of the provisioning system.



DAVID Y. ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER